



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/527,917 | 10/14/2005 | Eberhard Rau | 3186 | 8573 |
| 7590 Striker Striker & Stenby 103 East Neck Road Huntington, NY 11743 | | | | |
| 09/22/2008 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| CAZAN, LIVIUS RADU | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3729 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 09/22/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/527,917

Applicant(s)

RAU ET AL.

Examiner

LIVIOUS R. CAZAN

Art Unit

3729

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LIVIOUS R. CAZAN (Examiner).(3) L. ZBOROVSKY (For Applicant(s)).(2) A. DEXTER TUGBANG (Primary Examiner).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 September 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 10 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Possible claim language was discussed that would more clearly define Applicant's invention, particularly with respect to the yoke height and the tolerance and their relationship to other structural elements. The Examiner suggested wording the independent claims so as to make it clear that the method actively requires applying the given formula in calculating the weld seam depth. Applicants to file a supplemental amendment formally for consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/A. Dexter Tugbang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3729